

men, superior to the Slavs in military organization and discipline, but inferior to them in almost every other respect. How numerous this band or horde was, is unknown; but an approximate estimate of its numerical strength may be made by comparing it with that of another Bulgar band, which about the same time entered modern Hungary under the leadership of a brother of the man who was at the head of the Balkan Bulgars. This band, it is said, numbered 9,000 men. There is no reason to suppose that the Bulgars who entered the Balkan Peninsula were much more numerous. Granting, however, that they were twice or ten times that number, it is absurd to suppose that a nation like the Bulgarians of to-day, which numbers about six millions, can be the direct descendants of the original Bulgars. Historical facts contradict such a supposition, and prove that the modern Bulgarians take their origin from the numerous Slavs, who in overwhelming numbers inhabited the territory which they occupy at the present day. These facts, briefly stated, are the following:

1. Before the arrival of the Bulgar conquerors and the establishment by them of a Kingdom, in which the Slavic element was by far the most predominant, the Slavs in the Peninsula were in great danger of falling under the rule of the Byzantine emperors. The lack of political and social cohesion among the tribes

2. When in the second half of the tenth century the eastern part of the Bulgarian Kingdom fell under Byzantine rule a long struggle, lasting forty years, was stoutly maintained in the west—that is, in Macedonia—against Byzantine attacks. The center of this western Kingdom was in Macedonia and not in Bulgaria proper, and all chroniclers—Greek, Arab, Armenian and others—speak of it as Bulgarian and of the people who took part in the struggle as Bulgarians. It is positively certain that the original Bulgars never set foot in Macedonia, the population of which was for the

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE BALKAN SLAVS 9

most part Slav. The part which these Slavs took in fighting for the independence of the Bulgarian Kingdom, and the name Bulgarians by which they are designated, proves that the original Bulgars had by that time been thoroughly Slavicized. Their name had become synonymous with that of Slav, and their kingdom in the eyes of the Macedonian Slavs was a Slavic kingdom, a kingdom of their own.

3. When in 885 Methodius, who with his younger brother Cyril had preached Christianity to the Slavs in Moravia, died, his pupils, said to have numbered about 200, were exposed to the persecution of the German hierarchy. They left Moravia and took refuge in Bulgaria, which at that time occupied the position of the most prominent Slavic State. Both the government and the people received them gladly, and they found themselves among their own co-nationals, Slavs like themselves. They brought with them Slavic church books, and many of them were given important appointments in the Church of Bulgaria. These men certainly would not have come to Bulgaria with their Slavic books, if the country had been peopled by a Tartar or Turk population with a language totally unlike the Slavic. In documents of the early part of the tenth century we find the word Bulgarian used for Slavic, and the language of the books spoken of as Bulgarian—that is, the language not of the original Bulgars, but of the Slavs who had assumed the name of Bulgarians.

4. With the introduction of Christianity into Bulgaria in the second half of the ninth century, the foundations of a literature were laid. It was the first lit-

In presenting these historical facts I hope that I have made it clear why the Bulgarians of the present day cannot be considered the descendants of the original Bulgars, who were so small in number that they were easily assimilated to and swallowed up in the overwhelming Slavic majority. The modern Bulgarian is essentially a Slavic language, akin to the Russian, Serbian, Croat, Slovene, etc. In their popular beliefs, folk-lore, customs and manners the Bulgarians in no way differ from the other Slavs, and have nothing in common with Tartars, Turks or Finns. Serbians, Russians and other Slavs have always recognized them as their brethren, and modern historians and philologists have proved beyond any doubt their Slavic origin. The late Czech historian, Prof. Jiretschek, who was a recognized authority on the history of the Balkan Slavs, says:

"The ancestors of the Bulgarians of to-day are not the small bands of Isperrikh's *Bulgars*, who in 679 took possession of Moesia on the Danube, but the *Slavs*, who in the course of the third to the seventh century

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE BALKAN SLAVS 11

had established themselves in Moesia, as well as in Thrace, Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, ay, almost in the whole Peninsula. The blood of the Finnish Bulgars [he considers the Bulgars Finns], which principally flowed in the veins of the noble families, seems to have long since vanished."

What happened to the original Bulgars in the Balkan Peninsula is not a unique ethnographic phenomenon without a parallel in history. Two centuries before, a Frankish tribe under the leadership of Clovis extended its conquests in Roman Gaul and established a kingdom among the Gallo-Romans, whom they subdued. The kingdom as well as the people received the name of the Frankish conqueror and to this day they are known as France and *Français*. The Germans still call France *Frankreich*, the Frank Kingdom, while

12 NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS AND CONDITIONS

the Frenchman still feels pride in his German name and does not consider it a derogation to his nationality to bear it.

The other case is still more to the point, for it is the exact counterpart of what took place in the Balkan Peninsula. Two centuries after the establishment of the Bulgar Kingdom, namely in 862, a band of warlike Northmen or Normans, bearing the name of *Russ* and racially a Scandinavian or Teutonic tribe, came from the north into Russia, subdued the disunited Slavic tribes around Kiev, and laid the foundations of the modern Russian State. As in Bulgaria, so in Russia the names of the first rulers and of many nobles, which have been preserved in the Russian chronicles, are of foreign and not Slavic origin. In a Russian chronicle we have mention made of a delegation of about twenty Russians who were sent to Constantinople, I think it was in the tenth century, to make a treaty with Byzantium. Of the names which are given of these people not a single one is a Slavic name; they are all Teutonic.